

REMARKS

Consideration of Information Disclosure Statement Previously Submitted

Before or with mailing the notice of allowance in this application, Assignee respectfully requests that the Examiner send a signed acknowledgment of the Information Disclosure Statement submitted to the PTO by Assignee on August 26, 2004 and re-submitted by facsimile on January 26, 2006.

As set forth in the January 30, 2006 Interview Summary in one of Assignee's prior responses (mailed April 6, 2006), the Examiner asked for the re-submission of Form PTO/SB/08a listing all of the cited references that were originally submitted August 26, 2004 and received by the PTO on August 30, 2004 because the Examiner could not locate the Form PTO/SB/08a. Assignee re-submitted this form by facsimile on January 26, 2006, and the Examiner indicated she would fully consider all of the art cited in the Information Disclosure Statement prior to issuing another office action. However, the undersigned attorney has yet to receive a signed form acknowledging that the Examiner considered this art, either with the Office Action mailed June 30, 2006 or the Action mailed February 8, 2007. Assignee reiterates its request that the Examiner please send a signed acknowledgment that she considered the art cited by Assignee as soon as possible and no later than the mailing of the notice of allowance in this application.

Contents of the Action

Claims 1-4, 6-16, 18-24, and 26 were pending in this application. Assignee and the undersigned attorney thank Examiner Davis for her review of this patent application; the

U.S. Serial No. 10/763,035
AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION AND
PETITION FOR TWO-MONTH TIME EXTENSION

allowance of claims 11-13, 18, 19, 24, and 26; and the indication that claims 8 and 23 contain allowable subject matter. Claims 7, 9, 10, and 22 were withdrawn from examination pursuant to the election of species requirement issued by the PTO in a previous office action.

In the Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 14, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of each of two newly-cited prior art references: (1) U.S. Patent No. 5,174,642 to *Brohard et al* ("*Brohard*") and (2) U.S. Patent No. 4,162,779 to *Van Steenhoven et al*. ("*Van Steenhoven*"). The Examiner also rejected claims 2 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Brohard* in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,402,494 to *Gray* ("*Gray*"). The Examiner also rejected claims 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Brohard*.

Explanation of Claim Amendments

In the above amendment, claims 1, 7-10, and 20-22 are canceled; claims 2, 3, 14-16, 23, and 24 are amended; and new claims 27-36 are added.

Claims 2-4, 6, 11-16, and 31-33

Claims 11-13 have previously been allowed. Claims 2, 3, and 14-16 are amended above to depend from allowed claim 11, and claims 4 and 6 also now ultimately depend from allowed claim 11. Additionally, new claims 31-33 depend from allowed claim 11. Inasmuch as claims 2-4, 6, 14-16, and 31-33 depend from and thereby include the limitations of allowed claim 11, claims 2-4, 6, 14-16, and 31-33 should also be allowed for at least such dependencies.

Claims 18 and 19

Claims 18 and 19 have previously been allowed.

Claims 23 and 34-36

The Action objected to claim 23 as being dependent on a rejected base claim (claim 21), but indicated claim 23 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim. Claim 23 was indicated as having allowable subject matter in the first office action in this application, prior to any amendments to base claim 21. Accordingly, claim 23 is amended above into independent format and includes all of the limitations of original claim 21, which should put claim 23 in condition for allowance. New claims 34-36 depend from allowable claim 23. Inasmuch as claims 34-36 depend from and thereby include the limitations of claim 23, claims 34-36 should also be allowed for at least such dependencies.

Claims 24 and 26-30

Claims 24 and 26 have previously been allowed. New claims 27-30 depend from allowed claim 24. Inasmuch as claims 27-30 depend from and thereby include the limitations of allowed claim 24, claims 27-30 should also be allowed for at least such dependencies.

Conclusion


The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the Action mailed February 8, 2007. Assignee submits that claims 2-4, 6, 11-16, 18, 19, 23, 24, and 26-36 are in condition for allowance, and notice of allowance is respectfully requested. The preceding

U.S. Serial No. 10/763,035
AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION AND
PETITION FOR TWO-MONTH TIME EXTENSION

arguments in favor of patentability are advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. If the Examiner believes there are any issues that can be resolved via a telephone conference, or there are any informalities that can be corrected by an Examiner's amendment, please call Geoffrey Gavin at (404) 815-6046.

A credit card charge account authorization to cover the appropriate fee for the two-month time extension is included. Assignee paid for 25 total claims at the time of filing, so it is believed no fee is due based on the cancellation and addition of claims herein. The undersigned attorney believes no other fees are due; however, the Commissioner is authorized to debit deposit account no. 11-0855 to the extent necessary if other fees are due.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'G.K. Gavin', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Geoffrey K. Gavin
Registration No. 47,591

Date: July 9, 2007

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
1100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2800
Atlanta, GA 30309-4530
(404) 815-6046